Date: Fri, 9 Apr 93 04:30:21 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #90
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest   Fri, 9 Apr 93   Volume 93 : Issue   90

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1993 00:09:51
From: his!UUCP@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Organization: HP - Systems Technology Division

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
: In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:
:
: In general, the rules say the content of amateur transmissions shall
: "be of such an unimportant nature that recourse to the public
: telecommunications service is not justified" and "No station shall
: transmit communications as an alternative to other authorized radio
: services, except as necessary to provide emergency communications."
: The latter, from Part 97.113, is pretty clear. If a cellular phone
: could provide the communications, you can't use an amateur radio
: phone patch.

Ok, let's auger down on this part. Since the Cellular network now covers

every major city, most minor ones, and all the roads in between, it would seem to be illegal to use an autopatch almost anywhere in the country, except in an emergency, of course.

That doesn't seem right either. I would focus on the words "as an alternative"
as operative here. To me, they are trying to prevent amateur radio from competing with the phone company, which I expect everyone would agree with. Competition would imply a regular or high volume of usage, a gray area to be sure, but something which the amateur community should be able to self-police.
There are lots of things a Cell phone "could" do, but that's not the point.

Greg KD6KGW

Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1993 02:50:19
From: his!UUCP@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Organization: Sun Microsystems, Phoenix, AZ

In article <C56nE5.11I@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>
frankb@sad.hp.com (Frank Ball) writes:
>
>This sounds legal. Hams put cameras in RC airplanes and that is legal.
>The driver won't be in control of the camera, you are.
>

But BE CAREFUL! If the driver swoops down on some nude sunbathers,
POOF! there goes your license!

By the way, what frequency is it on? :-)

-fred

--
[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ   Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
[Sun Microsystems,   Southwest Area Solaris Transition Manager]
[Phoenix, AZ   (602) 224-3517]

Date: Thu, 08 Apr 1993 22:17:08
From: his!UUCP@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Organization: BDS Systems

> The idea is to give those of us hanging out in the paddock area a
> view of what's going on out on the track. This would be just for
> fun, and in no way involved in the actual business of running of the
> event. I would like to set up a control link so that I could switch
> the transmitter on-and-off via 220 or 440.

Sure, it's legal. Since you are placing a way to turn off the transmitter
via the control link, then you are using "remote control" of the station.

  97.109 Station Control (b). When a station is being remotely controlled,
  the control operator must be present at the control point. Any station may
  be remotely controlled.

Make sure you meet the rules for remote control though:

  97.213 Remote Control of a station

  An amateur station may be remotely controlled where:

  (a) There is a radio or wireline control link between the control point
and
  the station sufficient for the control operator to perform his/her duties.
  If radio, the control link must use an auxiliarly station.

  (b) Provisions are incorporated to limit transmission by the station to a
  period of no more than 3 minutes in the event of malfunction of the control
  link.

  (c) A photocopy of the station license and a label with the name, address,
  and telephone number of the station licensee and at least one designated
  control operator is posted in a conspicuous place at the station location.

Now for auxiliary stations (your control link):
  97.201 Auxiliary Station.
  (a) Any amateur station licensed to a holder of a [Technican or higher]
   operator license may be an auxilliary station. A holder of a [Technician
   or higher] operator license may be the control operator of an auxiliary
   station, subect to the priveleges of the class of operator license held.

  (b) An auxiliary station may transmit only on the 1.25m and shorter
  wavelengths, except the 431-433 MHz and 435-438 MHz segments.

(c) Where an auxiliary station causes harmfull interference to another auxiliary station, the licensees are equally and fully responsible for resolving the interference unless one station's operation is recommended by a frequency coordinator and the other station's is not. In that case, the licensee of the non-coordinated station has primary responsibility to resolve the interference.

(d) An auxiliary station may be automatically controlled only when it is part of a system that includes a repeater that is also being automatically controlled. [I have never understood the reason for this rule]

(e) An auxiliary station may transmit one-way communications.

Date: 9 Apr 1993 11:13:24 +0300
From: mcsun!news.funet.fi!butler.cc.tut.fi!lehtori.cc.tut.fi!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1354@arrl.org>, <1993Apr8.155021.3317@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <paulf.734323544@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>le
Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> From a practical standpoint, the only "spectral efficiency" that counts is
> the amount of spectrum occupied per user.

This is true only if you are active for a predefined amount of time (eg. one hour each day) regardless you are using CW or SSB. On the other hand, if you are content with say 10 "standard" QSOs per day, the spectral efficiency question is much more complicated.

> I have yet to see any DSPish
> system (proposed or otherwise) that occupies less than 100 Hz per user.

Keep in mind that every packed switched system (not just AX.25) operates in bursts and thus the wider channel is not allocated all the time. In on-line digital QSOs (CW, Pactor, Clover, AX.25) the throughput is limited by the ability of the operator to send (key or type) or receive (copy or read). Again, bandwidth is not equivalent to spectral efficiency.

A transmitted CW-signal might occupy less than 100 Hz, but this doesn't automaticly mean that you can put 10 CW signals in every kHz at least

on regular basis.

Mail: Hameenpuisto 42 A 26   Phone   : +358-31-133 657
      SF-33200 TAMPERE   Telex   : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)
      FINLAND   Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.tele.fi
X.400 :   G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Elisa-Tampere A=ELISA C=FI

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #90
****